

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, and 6 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 2 and 6 in light of the Examiner's rejection. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,819,178 ("Cropper"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must disclose every element of the claim, as arranged in the claim, and in sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the anticipated subject matter. See, PPG Industries, Inc. v. Guardian Industries Corp., 75 F.3d 1558, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1996); C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998). A reference that does not expressly disclose all of the elements of a claimed invention cannot anticipate unless all of the undisclosed elements are inherently present in the reference. See, Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 942 F.2d 1264, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Among the limitations of Applicant's independent claims not present in the cited reference is transmitting the packet received from said interface portion to said predetermined server or network-connected device when said contents of said packet distributing table represents that said terminal station has not been authenticated for said LAN.

According to Applicant's claims, the received packet is transmitted from the interface portion to the server or network-connected device when the terminal station has not been authenticated for the LAN.

In contrast, in Cropper, server 130 searches the visitor location register (VLR) database for subscriber data corresponding to the mobile identification number in the registration request. If the mobile terminal has not been previously registered, the network will not find subscriber data corresponding to the mobile identification number in the VLR. The intersystem roaming database is then searched for an address corresponding to the mobile identification number. The HLR/VLR/ISR then starts a subscriber data request timer and broadcasts a subscriber data request to the other home location registers (HLRs) of the other wireless networks. The HLR of the home network of the mobile terminal corresponding to the mobile identification number provides the subscriber data request by copying subscriber data of the HLR/VLR/ISR of the wireless network. However, at no time does Cropper transmit the packet received from the interface portion to the predetermined server when the terminal has not been authenticated for the LAN. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Cropper fails to disclose the contents of independent claims 1, 5, and 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 5 are allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,873,609 ("Jones") in view of Router Plugins: A

Software Architecture for Next Generation Routers ("Decasper"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See, In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencel, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicant.

Jones fails to show "transmitting the packet received from said introduced portion to said predetermined server network-connecting device when said contents of said first package distributing table represented said terminal station has not been authenticated for said LAN."

In Jones, a new user ID and temporary password is provided to an authentication server. A set of protocol filters bars the user from accessing any other service other than the point-to-point protocol session that is established. Thus, a general or non-authenticated user can still gain access to the wireless network for the purpose of new user registration only. However, at no time is the packet received from the interface portion transmitted to the predetermined server or network connected device when the contents of the first packet distributing table represent that the terminal has not been authenticated for the LAN as explicitly recited in Applicant's claim. In Jones, an authentication takes place when the user ID and temporary password are provided.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Jones be withdrawn as the Decasper fails to cure the deficiency in Jones discussed above.

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cropper in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,397,056 ("Bugnon"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 depend from allowable claims as discussed above. Bugnon fails to cure the deficiencies in Cropper discussed above. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cropper in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,609,491 ("Peck"). Peck fails to cure the deficiencies in Cropper discussed above. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Application No.: 09/963,261

Docket No.: Y1929.0085

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: September 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY
LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs